

PATENT

Attorney Docket No: BRI/016

REMARKS

The June 23, 2005 Office Action rejected all claims as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,224,487 to Simonsen. In response, the present amendment amends claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, and 22, cancels claims 7-12, and adds new claims 27-32.

Regarding the Section 112 rejections, the amendments to independent claims 20 and 21 correct the lack of antecedent basis and remove the term, "minimal clearance."

As amended, independent claims 1, 20, and 21 each include limitations that, it is respectfully submitted, clearly distinguish Simonsen alone or in view of the other known prior art.

Whereas the previously-added "molded" limitation of independent claim 1 was disregarded as a process limitation in the final Office Action, claim 1 now recites - in a purely structural format - "a projectile formed of polymer as an integral part of said [polymer] housing." The claimed integrally-formed polymer (and thus electrically non-conductive) projectile provides reduced complexity, easier assembly and enhanced reliability, and is novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

Whereas the previously-added "integral single piece ... having a uniform thickness" limitation of independent claim 20 was rendered moot in light of the Examiner's interpretation of the "fuse" as only consisting of the filament (15) and not including the conductors (11) of U.S. Patent No. 4,224,487, claim 20 now clearly requires that

PATENT

Attorney Docket No: BRI/016

the entire portion between the securing means has a uniform thickness, reciting that the "electrically conductive portion ha[s] a first end and a second end, said means for secure incorporation including a first portion at said first end and a second portion at said second end, said electrically conductive portion being an integral single piece that has a uniform thickness throughout the distance between said first portion and said second portion of said means for secure incorporation." This feature also provides reduced complexity, easier assembly and enhanced reliability, and is novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

Finally, independent claim 21 has been amended to replace the "whereas" term with the means-plus-function limitation "means for breaking said electrically conductive portion using the output of said pyrotechnic igniter," which, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶6, "shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof." It is submitted that the prior art of record does not include the same or equivalent structure to either an integrally-molded polymer projectile or a direct pyrotechnic output breaking means with no moving projectile.

PATENT

Attorney Docket No: BRI/016

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the presently amended application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 8, 2006

/ Thomas J. Brindisi /
THOMAS J. BRINDISI
Reg. No. 40,348

20 28th Place, Suite B
Venice, California 90291
Tel. (310) 439-2901
Fax. (310) 439-2902